Elementary algorithms from advanced mechanics

Siu A. Chin

Department of Physics and Astronomy,

*Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843, USA**

arXiv:1607.03882v1 [physics.ed-ph] 13 Jul 2016

Abstract

Most elementary numerical schemes found useful for solving classical trajectory problems are *canonical transformations*. This fact should be make more widely known among teachers of computational physics and Hamiltonian mechanics. It is very surprising that in order to solve a simple second-order differential equation, one has to invoke the deepest part, the Poissonian formulation, of classical mechanics. From the perspective of advanced mechanics, there are no bewildering number of seemingly arbitrary elementary schemes based on Taylor's expansion. There are only *two* canonical second-order algorithms, on the basis of which one can build numerical schemes of any order.

I. INTRODUCTION

More than 30 years ago, there was a flurry of discussion in this journal detailing the merits of various elementary numerical schemes for solving particle trajectories in classical mechanics.[1–4] The focus was on solving Newton's equation-of-motion as a second-order differential equation. The effectiveness of these numerical schemes were not well understood in that seemingly slight changes in the algorithm, without altering the order of the Taylor expansion, can drastically change the stability of the algorithm. The history of each numerical scheme, especially that of Cromer,[1] seems to suggest that good algorithms are just a matter of accidental discovery or personal insights. There does not seem to be order and structure to the study of numerical methods, only endless Taylor expansions with arbitrary term arrangements.

This impression is incorrect. Without exception, all elementary algorithms that have been found useful in solving Newton's equation-of-motion, such as Cromer, velocity-Verlet, leap-frog, etc., are all *canonical transformations*, or in modern terms, *symplectic integrators*. All can be derived systematically from a single, unifying idea of Poisson's equation-of-motion via Lie series (or transforms). There is no arbitrariness at all. There are only two standard, literally "canonical", first and second-order algorithms, out of which nearly all low order algorithms can be built. While this "modern synthesis" has been known for some time in the literature, it has yet to impact the teaching of computational physics at the secondary or undergraduate level. The purpose of this article is to make it clear, that even the most elementary numerical algorithms, are deeply rooted in advanced mechanics. Knowing this synthesis will therefore enrich *both* the teaching of computational physics[5] and advanced mechanics.[6]

The topic of symplectic integrators has been reviewed in this journal by Donnelly and Rogers.[7] They begin their discussion directly with the symplectic form of Hamilton's equations and give the impression that symplectic integrators are mostly a modern invention from the 1990's. This work will provide a more measured and historical introduction, emphasizing the fact that low-order algorithms have always existed and are as old as canonical transformations themselves. Also, both Donnelly and Rogers[7] and Timberlake and Hasbun[5] have cited Liouville's theorem as the basic explanation of a symplectic integrator's stability. While this explanation is correct, it is not the *a priori* reason why a numerical scheme is

stable. The stability of any numerical scheme, symplectic or not, can be explained entirely in terms of its own error propagation, without any external references to Hamiltonian mechanics or Liouville's theorem. This distinction will be clarified in Section III. Moreover, how Liouville's theorem, a consequence of the *continuum time* Hamiltonian mechanics, is preserved by *discrete time* algorithms, can be best understood as due to the *sequentual* updating of conjugate variables, an often overlooked property of canonical transformations. Thus the stability of symplectic integrators is ultimately due to the simple (and seemingly tautological) fact that they *are* canonical transformations.

In order to make this work self-contain, and accesssible to undergraduates, I begin in Section II with a review of the *four* fundamental formulations of classical mechanics. The purpose here is to provide an outline of key ideas so that the reader can see the whole picture and encourage he/she to read up more on advanced mechanics. As we will see, each formulation of classical mechanics provides a distinctive basis for approximating the exact trajectory numerically. Canonical transformations are discuss in Section IV, from which two fundamental first-order and second-order algorithms are derived. Lie operators are defined via Poisson brackets in Section V and various elementary algorithms are systematically derived using Lie series/transforms. Section VI characterizes the error of each symplectic integrator precisely in terms of its modified Hamiltonian. Section VII describes ways of constructing fourth and higher order symplectic integrators, some with purely positive time steps. Section VIII describe higher-order non-symplectic, Runge-Kutta-Nyström (RKN) schemes. The reason to revisit non-symplectic schemes at higher order is that the number of force-evaluations required for an nth-order symplectic integrator proliferates exponentially as $\sim 2^n$. By contrast, the growth for RKN algorithms at high-order is only $\sim n^2$. Thus at higher-order, it maybe more efficient to use RKN schemes. Section IX summarizes key conclusions of this article.

II. THE FOUR FORMULATIONS OF CLASSICAL MECHANICS

Newton's second law is the physical principle by which we understand the motion of classical particles. However, there are many ways in which this principle can be formulated mathematically. The first is the *Newtonian* formulation, where the equation-of-motion is

the text-book equation:

$$m\ddot{x}_i = F_i. \tag{2.1}$$

This is the basis for most elementary discussions of numerical methods. For a conservative system, with momenta and forces given by

$$p_i = m\dot{x}_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad F_i = -\frac{\partial V}{\partial x_i}, \tag{2.2}$$

the above can be recasted closer to Newton's original formulation:

$$\dot{p}_i = -\frac{\partial V}{\partial x_i}. \tag{2.3}$$

In the following, we will consider only potential functions of the coordinates. (For cases where V is explicitly time- or velocity-dependent, see references cited in Section IX.)

The second formulation is *Lagrangian*. Here, particle positions are first generalized to *generalized coordinates* q_i, such as angles, to automatically satisfy constraints. The physical trajectory between time t_1 and t_2 is taken to be the one which renders the action integral

$$S = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} L(q_i(t), \dot{q}_i(t))dt, \tag{2.4}$$

stationary, with the Lagrangian function given by

$$L = \frac{1}{2}m\sum_{i=1}^{n}\dot{q}_i^2 - V(q_i). \tag{2.5}$$

In terms of the *generalize momentum* defined by

$$p_i = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_i}, \tag{2.6}$$

the stationary condition yields the Euler-Lagrangian equation

$$\dot{p}_i = \frac{\partial L}{\partial q_i}, \tag{2.7}$$

which is Newton's second law viewed from a more global perspective. The importance of the Lagrangian formulation, from a purely classical perspective, is the introduction of constraint-satisfying generalized-coordinate q_i and its conjugate generalized momentum p_i.

The third, *Hamiltonian* formulation, elevates the generalized momentum (2.6) as a separate and *independent* degree of freedom, no longer enslaved to the generalize coordinate as

its time-derivative. Thus starting from the Lagrangian (2.5), one defines p_i as in (2.6) and replaces all references to $\dot{q}_i$ by p_i in the Hamiltonian function

$$\begin{aligned} H(p,q) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i \dot{q}_i - L(q_i, \dot{q}_i), \\ &= \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i^2 + V(q_i). \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

The dynamics is then given by Hamilton's equations,

$$\dot{q}_i = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i}, \qquad \dot{p}_i = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q_i}. \tag{2.9}$$

Note that Hamilton's equations are generally not the same as reducing a second-order differential equation to a pair of first-order equations. In more complicated cases, the generalized momentum need *not* be simply proportional to the time derivative of the generalized coordinate.

Just as some problems are easier to solve by use of spherical coordinates rather Cartesian coordinates, some dynamical problems are easier to solve by transformations that completely mix up the n generalize momenta p_i *and* the n generalize coordinates q_i. In order for these transformed variables to solve the same dynamical problem, they must obey Hamilton's equation with respect to the Hamiltonian of the transformed variables. Transformations that can do this are called *canonical*. Canonical transformations make full use of the $2n$ degrees-of-freedom of Hamiltonian dynamics and are the fundamental building blocks of symplectic integrators.

The *Poissonian* formulation of mechanics expresses the dynamics of a system via *Poisson brackets*, which are the same for all canonically transformed variables. The Poissonian formulation is therefore independent of any particular choice of generalized coordinates and momenta, as long as they are canonically related. This formulation thus reflects the intrinsic reality of the dynamics, irrespective of its mode of description.

For any dynamical variable $W(q_i, p_i)$, the fundamental Poisson equation governing its evolution is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} W(q_i, p_i) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Big(\frac{\partial W}{\partial q_i} \frac{\partial q_i}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial W}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial p_i}{\partial t} \Big), \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Big(\frac{\partial W}{\partial q_i} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} - \frac{\partial W}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial H}{\partial q_i} \Big) \equiv \{W, H\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

where Hamilton's equations (2.9) have been used to obtain the second line. The last equality defines the Poisson bracket of W and H.

III. STABILITY OF NUMERICAL ALGORITHMS

For simplicity, let's start with a one-dimensional problem with only a spatial-dependent potential $V(x)$. In this case one has Newton's second law in text-book form (2.1). Through out this work, we will let $\dot{x}$ and $\ddot{x}$ denote the *kinematic velocity* and *acceleration* and reserve the symbol v and a for denoting

$$v \equiv \frac{p}{m} \qquad \text{and} \qquad a(x) \equiv \frac{F(x)}{m}. \tag{3.1}$$

(This distinction is important. In the Newtonian case, when the momentum p is defined as $p = m\dot{x}$, then one recovers that $v = \dot{x}$. When p is not so simply given, as in the Hamiltonian formulation, v will no longer be just $\dot{x}$.) In the Newtonian formulation, (2.1) suggests that dynamics is just a matter of solving the second-order differential equation:

$$\ddot{x} = a(x) \tag{3.2}$$

which can be decoupled into a pair of equations

$$\dot{x} = v \qquad \text{and} \qquad \dot{v} = a(x). \tag{3.3}$$

If x_n and v_n are the values at $t = n\Delta t$, then a truncation of Taylor's expansion to first order in Δt,

$$x(t + \Delta t) = x(t) + \dot{x}(t)\Delta t + O(\Delta t^2)$$

yields the Euler algorithm

$$x_{n+1} = x_n + v_n \Delta t, \qquad v_{n+1} = v_n + a_n \Delta t, \tag{3.4}$$

where $a_n = a(x_n)$. If a_n is not a constant, this algorithm is unstable for any Δt, no matter how small. Let's see why. Let $x_n = \tilde{x}_n + \epsilon_n$ and $v_n = \tilde{v}_n + \delta_n$, where $\tilde{x}_n$ are $\tilde{v}_n$ are the exact values at time step n, and ϵ_n and δ_n are the errors of the algorithmic values x_n and v_n respectively. For a general one-step algorithm,

$$x_{n+1} = x_{n+1}(x_n, v_n), \qquad v_{n+1} = v_{n+1}(x_n, v_n), \tag{3.5}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}_{n+1} + \epsilon_{n+1} &= x_{n+1}(x_n + \epsilon_n, v_n + \delta_n) \\ &= x_{n+1}(x_n, v_n) + \frac{\partial x_{n+1}(x_n, v_n)}{\partial x_n}\epsilon_n + \frac{\partial x_{n+1}(x_n, v_n)}{\partial v_n}\delta_n + \cdots. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

If the numerical scheme is exact, then $x_{n+1}(x_n, v_n) = \tilde{x}_{n+1}$. If not, the difference is the truncation error of the algorithm. For a first-order algorithm, the truncation error would be $O(\Delta t^2)$. Let's ignore this *systematic* error of the algorithm and concentrate on how the errors propagate from one step to the next. Doing the same analysis for v_{n+1} then yields

$$\begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_{n+1} \\ \delta_{n+1} \end{pmatrix} = M \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_n \\ \delta_n \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.7}$$

where the *errors propagation* matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial x_{n+1}}{\partial x_n} & \frac{\partial x_{n+1}}{\partial v_n} \\ \frac{\partial v_{n+1}}{\partial x_n} & \frac{\partial v_{n+1}}{\partial v_n} \end{pmatrix} \equiv \frac{\partial(x^{n+1}, v^{n+1})}{\partial(x^n, v^n)}, \tag{3.8}$$

is identical to the *Jacobian* matrix for the transformation of variables (x_n, v_n) to variables (x_{n+1}, v_{n+1}). For the harmonic oscillator, the transformation $(x_n, v_n) \to (x_{n+1}, v_{n+1})$ is linear in $\{x_n, v_n\}$ and M is a constant matrix. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_n \\ \delta_n \end{pmatrix} = M^n \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_0 \\ \delta_0 \end{pmatrix} &= \left[S^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 \end{pmatrix} S \right]^n \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_0 \\ \delta_0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ &= S^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1^n & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2^n \end{pmatrix} S \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_0 \\ \delta_0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

where M has been diagonalized with eigenvalues λ_1 and λ_2. Thus the errors of the algorithm grows exponentially with the modulus of the eigenvalues. Since M is a 2×2 matrix, the eigenvalues are solutions to a quadratic equation given by

$$\lambda_{1,2} = \frac{T}{2} \pm \sqrt{\left(\frac{T}{2}\right)^2 - D}, \tag{3.10}$$

where T and D are the trace and determinant of M respectively. If the eigenvalues are complex, then they must be complex conjugates of each other, $\lambda_2 = \lambda_1^*$, with the same modulus $\lambda = \sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}$. But $\lambda_1 \lambda_2 = \det M$, thus, the error will *not* grow, *i.e.*, the algorthm will be stable, *only if* it has unit modulus, or $\det M = 1$. In this case, one can rewrite (3.10) as

$$\lambda_{1,2} = \frac{T}{2} \pm i\sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{T}{2}\right)^2} = \cos\theta \pm i \sin\theta = \mathrm{e}^{\pm i\theta}, \tag{3.11}$$

where one has defined $\cos\theta = T/2$, which is possible whenever $|T/2| \leq 1$. At larger Δt, when $|T/2| \geq 1$, the eigenvalues then become real. Since $\lambda_1 \lambda_2 = \det M = 1$, one eigenvalue

must have modulus greater than one and the algorithm then becomes unstable. Thus one can conclude that: 1) an algorithm can be stable only if $\det M = 1$, and 2) the range of stability is given by $|T/2| \leq 1$. Let's examine the stability of Euler's algorithm (3.4) in this light.

For the harmonic oscillator, $a_n = -\omega^2 x_n$, where $\omega^2 = k/m$. The Jacobian, or the error-propagation matrix for the Euler algorithm is

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \Delta t \\ -\omega^2 \Delta t & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.12}$$

with $\det M = 1 + \omega^2 \Delta t^2$ and complex eigenvalues having modulus $|\lambda| = \sqrt{1 + \omega^2 \Delta t^2} > 1$. Thus the algorithm is *unstable* at any finite Δt, no matter how small.

By constrast, the "Cromer" algorithm,[1] corresponding to

$$v_{n+1} = v_n + a_n \Delta t, \qquad x_{n+1} = x_n + v_{n+1} \Delta t, \tag{3.13}$$

when applied to the harmonic oscillator, has the Jacobian matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \omega^2 \Delta t^2 & \Delta t \\ -\omega^2 \Delta t & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.14}$$

This seemingly minor change now gives $\det M = 1$. In contrast to the Euler algorithm, this algorithm uses the updated v_{n+1} to compute the new x_{n+1}. Since here $T/2 = 1 - \omega^2 \Delta t^2/2$, when Δt increases from zero, the algorithm is stable as the two eigenvalues $\mathrm{e}^{\pm i\theta}$ starting out both equal to 1 at $\theta = 0$ and race above and below the unit complex circle until both are equal to -1 at $\theta = \pi$. This point defines the largest Δt for which the algorithm is stable: $1 - \omega^2 \Delta t^2/2 = -1$, or $\Delta t = 2/\omega$, which is nearly a third of the harmonic oscillator period $P = 2\pi/\omega$. For Δt greater than this, $T/2 < -1$, the eigenvalue $T/2 - \sqrt{(T/2)^2 - 1}$ from (3.10) will have magnitude greater than 1 and the algorithm is then unstable.

In the general case where M is no longer a constant, Cromer's algorithm maintains $\det M = 1$ for an arbitrary $a(x)$ and is always stable at a sufficiently small Δt. The key to this alogrithm's stablity is its *sequentual* updating, which means that (3.13) can be viewed as a product of *two* transformations. The first, updating only v_n, is the transformation

$$v^*_{n+1} = v_n + a_n \Delta t, \quad x^*_{n+1} = x_n \quad \text{with} \quad M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ a'(x_n)\Delta t & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.15}$$

The second, updating only x_n, is the transformation

$$v_{n+1} = v^*_{n+1}, \quad x_{n+1} = x^*_{n+1} + v^*_{n+1}\Delta t \quad \text{with} \quad M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \Delta t \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.16}$$

Since each Jacobian matrix obviously has $\det M = 1$, their product is guaranteed to have $\det M = 1$. In the harmonic oscillator example, we have indeed

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \Delta t \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\omega^2\Delta t & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1-\omega^2\Delta t^2 & \Delta t \\ -\omega^2\Delta t & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.17}$$

This sequentual updating of conjugate variables x and v, guaranteeing $\det M = 1$, which is Liouville's theorem, is a hallmark of symplectic integrators. We will see how this arises naturally in the context of canonical transformations.

IV. CANONICAL TRANSFORMATIONS AND STABILITY

Each formulation of classical mechanics provides a different basis for deriving numerical algorithms for solving classical dyanamics. The Newtonian formulation is the basis for Runge-Kutta type schemes, which seeks to match the Taylor expansion of the exact solution by repeated evaluations of the force at various spatial and temporal intervals. This type of algorithms, which can be very accurate at high orders, has no simple way of guaranteeing $\det M = 1$, and is therefore ultimately unstable after a long time.

The Lagrangian formulation give rises to *variational integrators*,[8] obtained by first approximating the action integral (2.4) by quadratures, then by applying the stationary condition to *discretized* coordinates. The derivation of variational integrators is more involved, higher order integrators are more difficult to obtain, may not be explicit, and for solving classical dynamics problems, do not best symplectic integrators described below. We will therefore not discuss variational integrators in this work. Interest readers can consult Ref.8.

The Hamiltonian formulation is the fundamental arena for developing robust numerical algorithm because of its key idea of canonical transformations. For the standard Hamiltonian

$$H(q_i, p_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{p_i^2}{2m} + V(q_i), \tag{4.1}$$

a canonical transformation $(q_i, p_i) \to (Q_i, P_i)$ is a transformation such that Hamilton's equations are preserved for the new variables

$$\dot{Q}_i = \frac{\partial K}{\partial P_i}, \qquad \dot{P}_i = -\frac{\partial K}{\partial Q_i}, \tag{4.2}$$

with respect to the transformed Hamiltonian $K(Q_i, P_i) = H(q_i, p_i)$. Surprisingly, this seemingly difficulty task can be easily accomplished through the use of *generating* functions. In general, there are four types of generating functions[9,10], $F_1(q_i, Q_i), F_2(q_i, P_i), F_3(p_i, Q_i), F_4(p_i, P_i)$. For our purpose, we will only need to use F_2 and F_3 without any explicit time-dependence. The tranformation equations that preserves (4.2) are given by

$$p_i = \frac{\partial F_2(q_i, P_i)}{\partial q_i}, \qquad Q_i = \frac{\partial F_2(q_i, P_i)}{\partial P_i}, \tag{4.3}$$

and

$$q_i = -\frac{\partial F_3(p_i, Q_i)}{\partial p_i}, \qquad P_i = -\frac{\partial F_3(p_i, Q_i)}{\partial Q_i}. \tag{4.4}$$

Consider the case of F_2, Eq.(4.3). The first equation is an implicit equation for determining P_i in terms of q_i and p_i. The second, is an explicit equation for determining Q_i in terms of q_i *and* the updated P_i. This then can be naturally interpreted as a *sequence* of two transformations. The first equation is the transformation $(q_i, p_i) \to (q_i^*, p_i^*)$ according to

$$p_i = \frac{\partial F_2(q_i, p_i^*)}{\partial q_i}, \qquad q_i^* = q_i, \tag{4.5}$$

with

$$\det M_1 = \det \frac{(\partial q_i^*, \partial p_i^*)}{(\partial q_i, \partial p_i)} = \det \frac{(\partial p_i^*)}{(\partial p_i)}.$$

The second equation is the transformation $(q_i^*, p_i^*) \to (Q_i, P_i)$ according to

$$P_i = p_i^*, \qquad Q_i = \frac{\partial F_2(q_i^*, P_i)}{\partial P_i}, \tag{4.6}$$

with

$$\det M_2 = \det \frac{(\partial Q_i, \partial P_i)}{(\partial q_i^*, \partial p_i^*)} = \det \frac{(\partial Q_i)}{(\partial q_i^*)}.$$

The determinant of this two transformations is then

$$\det M = \det M_2 \det M_1 = \det \frac{(\partial Q_i)}{(\partial q_i^*)} \det \frac{(\partial p_i^*)}{(\partial p_i)} = \det \frac{(\partial Q_i)}{(\partial q_i)} / \det \frac{(\partial p_i)}{(\partial P_i)} = 1.$$

The last equality follows from (4.3), since $\partial Q_i/\partial q_i = \partial p_i/\partial P_i$. Similarly for F_3. This is essentially Landau and Lifshitz's proof,[10] but with the sequential nature of the updating made explicit. Thus a stable algorithm for evolving the system forward in time must necessarily be a canonical transformation.

In Hamiltonian mechanics, it is well known that the Hamiltonian is the *infinitesimal* generator of time evolution.[9,10] What is not realized for a long time is that even when

the Hamiltonian is used as a *finite* time generator, the resulting canonical transformation, through no longer exact in evolving the system forward in time, remained an excellent numerical algorithm. Let's take

$$F_2(q_i, P_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i P_i + \Delta t H(q_i, P_i) \tag{4.7}$$

where $H(q_i, p_i)$ is given by (4.1). For this generating function, Δt is simply an arbitrary parameter, need not be small. The transformation equations (4.3) then give,

$$P_i = p_i - \Delta t \frac{\partial V(q_i)}{\partial q_i}, \qquad Q_i = q_i + \Delta t \frac{P_i}{m} \tag{4.8}$$

If one regards (Q_i, P_i) as (q_i, p_i) at a time-step Δt later, then the above is precisely Cromer's algorithm. The transformation (4.8) is canonical regardless of the size of Δt, but it is an accurate scheme for evolving the system forward in time only when Δt is small. Similarly, taking

$$F_3(p_i, Q_i) = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i Q_i + \Delta t H(Q_i, p_i) \tag{4.9}$$

gives the other canonical algorithm

$$Q_i = q_i + \Delta t \frac{p_i}{m}, \qquad P_i = p_i - \Delta t \frac{\partial V(Q_i)}{\partial Q_i}, \tag{4.10}$$

which is Stanley's second LPA algorithm.[4] These two are the *canonical* (literally and technically), first-order algorithms for solving classical dynamic problems. For uniformity, we will refer to (4.8) and (4.10) as algorithm 1A and 1B respectively. In algorithm 1A, the momentum is updated first and the updated momentum is used to update the coordinate. In algorithm 1B, the coordinate is updated first, and the updated coordinate is used to compute the force to update the momentum. This sequentual, alternating updating of conjugate variables, as we have shown, and will see again in Section V, is a fundamental characteristic of symplectic integrators.

When these two algorithms are iterated, they are structurally identical to the leap-frog algorithm. The only difference is that, in leap-frog, each updating of p_i or q_i is viewed as happening in sequence, at different time. Here, p_i *and* q_i are regarded as being updated at the same time. After each updating of p_i and q_i, leap-frog views them as out of synchronization by a time step. For canonical algorithms, they are synchronized. This affects the evaluation of the energy, which requires the evaluation of p_i and q_i at the same time. On this basis, canonical algorithms are superior to leap-frog algorithms in conserving the energy.

Moreover, one can compute exactly how these two algorithms conserve the energy. They are respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} H'_{1A} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{P_i^2}{2m} + V(Q_i), \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(p_i - \Delta t \partial_i V)^2}{2m} + V(q_i + \frac{\Delta t}{m}[p_i - \Delta t \partial_i V]), \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{p_i^2}{2m} + V(q_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\Delta t^2}{2m}(\partial_i V)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\Delta t^2}{2m^2} p_i p_j \partial_i \partial_j V + O(\Delta t^3), \qquad (4.11) \\ H'_{1B} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(p_i - \Delta t \partial_i V(q_i + \Delta t p_i/m))^2}{2m} + V(q_i + \Delta t p_i/m), \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{p_i^2}{2m} + V(q_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\Delta t^2}{2m}(\partial_i V)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\Delta t^2}{2m^2} p_i p_j \partial_i \partial_j V + O(\Delta t^3) \qquad (4.12) \end{aligned}$$

and have precisely the opposite $O(\Delta t^2)$ local truncation error. (The global truncation error at any $t = n\Delta t$ is one power of Δt less and is given very simply by the method in Section VI.) By averaging these two algorithm, one would obtain a second-order Runge-Kutta algorithm:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_i &= q_i + \Delta t \frac{p_i}{m} - \frac{\Delta t^2}{2m} \partial_i V(q_i) \\ P_i &= p_i - \frac{\Delta t}{2}\Big(\partial_i V(q_i) + \partial_i V(q_i + \Delta t p_i/m)\Big). \end{aligned} \qquad (4.13)$$

The disadvantages of this scheme are two: First, one must evaluate the force twice. Second, one no longer has $\det M = 1$. A better choice is to apply 1A then 1B, each at $\Delta t/2$. The leading energy error will also cancel but the algorithm remains canonical with $\det M = 1$. Let's denote this algorithm as 2A:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_1 &= \mathbf{v}_0 + \frac{1}{2}\Delta t \mathbf{a}_0, \\ \mathbf{q}_1 &= \mathbf{q}_0 + \Delta t \mathbf{v}_1, \\ \mathbf{v}_2 &= \mathbf{v}_1 + \frac{1}{2}\Delta t \mathbf{a}_1. \end{aligned} \qquad (4.14)$$

The alternative choice of applying 1B first then 1A will be denoted as 2B:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{q}_1 &= \mathbf{q}_0 + \frac{1}{2}\Delta t \mathbf{v}_0, \\ \mathbf{v}_1 &= \mathbf{v}_0 + \Delta t \mathbf{a}_1, \\ \mathbf{q}_2 &= \mathbf{q}_1 + \frac{1}{2}\Delta t \mathbf{v}_1. \end{aligned} \qquad (4.15)$$

In both cases, the last step of the first algorithm and the first step of the second algorithm have been combined into the central step as shown. Again, we have defined here $\mathbf{v} \equiv \mathbf{p}/m$

and $\mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}_i) \equiv \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{q}_i)/m$. The initial values are denoted by $\mathbf{q}_0$ and $\mathbf{v}_0$ and the final values are last numbered $\mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{v}$. Each algorithm only requires one evaluation of the force.

The sequentual steps of algorithms 2A and 2B can be directly translated into programming lines and there is no need to combine them. However, for comparison, steps in 2A can be combined to give

$$\mathbf{q}_1 = \mathbf{q}_0 + \Delta t \mathbf{v}_0 + \frac{1}{2}\Delta t^2 \mathbf{a}_0, \tag{4.16}$$

$$\mathbf{v}_2 = \mathbf{v}_0 + \frac{1}{2}\Delta t(\mathbf{a}_0 + \mathbf{a}_1), \tag{4.17}$$

which is just the velocity-Verlet algorithm, or Stanley's *second-order Taylor approximation*, STA.[4] Note that the acceleration computed at the end, $\mathbf{a}_1$, can be reused as $\mathbf{a}_0$ at the start of the next iteration. Thus only one force-evaluation is needed. Algorithm 2B is referred to as the position-Verlet algorithm, which corresponds to Stanley's STA$'$ algorithm. These two *canonical* second-order algorithms were known before Stanley's time, but were unrecognized as canonical transformations among a host of other similarly looking algorithms.[4]

These two second-order schemes are not only more accurate than the two canonical first-order algorithms, they are also more correct qualitatively in that they are *time-reversible*, *i.e.*, if $\Delta t \to -\Delta t$ at any time, then each algorithm will retrace its steps back to the starting point. This is not true of first-order algorithms. Thus the qualitative behaviors of first-order algorithms are *not* representative of the exact solution, and there is no reason to use them in place of the above second-order algorithms, which also use only one-force evaluation.

In this Section, we have shown that the stability of elementary algorithms is fundamentally due to the fact they are canonical transformations. However, it is not easy to derive higher order canonical transformations by use of generator functions. To do this simply, we need the final formulation of mechanics.

V. POISSONIAN MECHANICS AND LIE TRANSFORMS

For any dyanmical function $S(q_i, p_i)$, we can define[11] an associated *Lie* operator $\hat{S}$ via the Poisson bracket

$$\hat{S} = \{\cdot, S\} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{n}\Big(\frac{\partial S}{\partial p_i}\frac{\partial}{\partial q_i} - \frac{\partial S}{\partial q_i}\frac{\partial}{\partial p_i}\Big), \tag{5.1}$$

that is, when $\hat{S}$ acts on any other dynamical function $W(q_i, p_i)$, its effect is

$$\hat{S}W = \{W, S\} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Big(\frac{\partial S}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial q_i} - \frac{\partial S}{\partial q_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} \Big) W. \tag{5.2}$$

(For this discusion, it is important to use intuitive and transparent notations. The direct use[9] of $\{\cdot, S\}$ leads to unwieldy expression for powers of $\hat{S}$ as $...\{\{\{\{\cdot, S\}, S\}, S\}, S\}...$ The old time typographical notation[12] of "$:S:$" is unfamiliar to modern readers. The use of "L_S" or "D_S" to denote a Lie operator is redundant, with the symbol "L" or "D" serving no purpose. In this work, we eschew these three conventions and follow the more familiar practice of quantum mechanics in denoting a Lie operator with a "caret" over its defining function, $\hat{S}$. Also, it is essential to define $\hat{S} = \{\cdot, S\}$, and *not* $\hat{S} = \{S, \cdot\}$, otherwise one gets a confusing negative sign for moving forward in time.)

The importance of introducing Lie operators is that the exponential of *any* Lie operator, called a *Lie transform*, defined by the infinite *Lie series*,

$$T_S = \mathrm{e}^{\epsilon \hat{S}} = 1 + \epsilon \hat{S} + \frac{1}{2!} + \epsilon^2 \hat{S}^2 + \frac{1}{3!} \epsilon^3 \hat{S}^3 + \cdots, \tag{5.3}$$

produces an *explicit* canonical transformation[11] via

$$Q_i = \mathrm{e}^{\epsilon \hat{S}} q_i, \qquad P_i = \mathrm{e}^{\epsilon \hat{S}} p_i. \tag{5.4}$$

The small parameter ϵ is introduced to guarantee the series' convergence to the exponential function. In this work, the exponentiated operator can be defined directly and this series expansion is just a formal tool.

To show that (5.4) is a canonical transformation, we can characterize the canonical nature of the conjugate variables by their fundamental Poisson brackets:

$$\{q_i, q_j\} = 0, \quad \{p_i, p_j\} = 0, \quad \{q_i, p_j\} = \delta_{ij}. \tag{5.5}$$

It then follows that the only vanishing Poisson bracket for the transformed variable is

$$\{Q_i, P_j\} = \{\mathrm{e}^{\epsilon \hat{S}} q_i, \mathrm{e}^{\epsilon \hat{S}} p_i\} = \mathrm{e}^{\epsilon \hat{S}} \{q_i, p_i\} = \mathrm{e}^{\epsilon \hat{S}} \delta_{ij} = \delta_{ij}, \tag{5.6}$$

and therefore canonical.[11] Since Lie operators are first-order differential operators, Lie transforms satisfy

$$\{\mathrm{e}^{\epsilon \hat{S}} q_i, \mathrm{e}^{\epsilon \hat{S}} p_i\} = \mathrm{e}^{\epsilon \hat{S}} \{q_i, p_i\}.$$

This would not be true if the Lie series (5.3) were truncated at any order. The last equality in (5.6) follows since δ_{ij} is a constant, and all series terms of $\mathrm{e}^{\epsilon\hat{S}}$ acting on it will vanish except the first term, which is 1.

The most important Lie operator is the Hamiltonian operator

$$\hat{H} = \sum_i \Big(\frac{p_i}{m} \frac{\partial}{\partial q_i} + F_i \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} \Big), \tag{5.7}$$

which we can write compactly as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H} &= \hat{T} + \hat{V} \\ &= \mathbf{v} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{q}} + \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

For H not explicitly dependent on time, Poisson's dynamical equation (2.10)

$$\frac{dW}{dt} = \hat{H} W = (\hat{T} + \hat{V}) W, \tag{5.9}$$

can be integrated to obtain the formal operator solution

$$W(t) = \mathrm{e}^{t(\hat{T}+\hat{V})} W(0) = \Big(\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t(\hat{T}+\hat{V})} \Big)^n W(0) \tag{5.10}$$

This form of the solution then immediately suggests alternative ways of approximating the exact trajectory. Since only Lie transforms can yield canonical transformations, one should approximate the short-time evolution operator $\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t(\hat{T}+\hat{V})}$ by a product of Lie transforms.[13,14] This is the process of *decomposition*, or more intuitively, *factorization*. The choice of constitutient Lie transforms is suggested by the solution (5.10) itself. Since $\mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ are independent variables,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{e}^{\Delta t \hat{T}} W(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v}) &= (1 + \Delta t \mathbf{v} \cdot \partial_{\mathbf{q}} + \frac{1}{2} \Delta t^2 (\mathbf{v} \cdot \partial_{\mathbf{q}})^2 + \cdots) W(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v}) \\ &= W(\mathbf{q} + \Delta t \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}), \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

the Lie series above is just the Taylor expansion and the Lie transform $\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t \hat{T}}$ is just a *shift* operator that shifts $\mathbf{q}$ by $\Delta t \mathbf{v}$. Similarly, since

$$\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t \hat{V}} W(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v}) = W(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v} + \Delta t \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q})), \tag{5.12}$$

$\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t \hat{V}}$ is the shift operator for $\mathbf{v}$. For Δt small, we can therefore approximate $\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t(\hat{T}+\hat{V})}$ by

$$\mathcal{T}_{1A}(\Delta t) = \mathrm{e}^{\Delta t \hat{V}} \mathrm{e}^{\Delta t \hat{T}} = \mathrm{e}^{\Delta t(\hat{T}+\hat{V})} + O(\Delta t^2). \tag{5.13}$$

The order of the error term can be verified by expanding out the Lie series on both sides. This approximation of the evolution operator then yields the following algorithm for approximating the trajectory:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{V}}\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{T}}W(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{v}) &= \mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{V}}W(\mathbf{q}+\Delta t\mathbf{v},\mathbf{v}) \\ &= W(\mathbf{q}+\Delta t(\mathbf{v}+\Delta t\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q})),\mathbf{v}+\Delta t\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q})). \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

Let $\mathbf{q}_0 = \mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{v}_0 = \mathbf{v}$ and the last values be the updated values, then the above corresponds to the updating

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_1 &= \mathbf{v}_0 + \Delta t\mathbf{a}_0 \\ \mathbf{q}_1 &= \mathbf{q}_0 + \Delta t\mathbf{v}_1, \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

which is the previously derived algorithm 1A. Note that the variables are updated in the *reversed* order of the applied Lie transforms, *i.e.,* the canonical variables are updated according to the Lie transforms from *left to right*. Similarily, the approximation

$$\mathcal{T}_{1B}(\Delta t) = \mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{T}}\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{V}} = \mathrm{e}^{\Delta t(\hat{T}+\hat{V})} + O(\Delta t^2), \tag{5.16}$$

yields the algorithm

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{T}}\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{V}}W(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{v}) &= \mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{T}}W(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{v}+\Delta t\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q})) \\ &= W(\mathbf{q}+\Delta t\mathbf{v},\mathbf{v}+\Delta t\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}+\Delta t\mathbf{v})). \end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

corresponds to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{q}_1 &= \mathbf{q}_0 + \Delta t\mathbf{v}_0 \\ \mathbf{v}_1 &= \mathbf{v}_0 + \Delta t\mathbf{a}_1, \end{aligned} \tag{5.18}$$

which is algorithm 1B. Thus, if $\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t(\hat{T}+\hat{V})}$ can be approximated by a product of shift operators $\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{T}}$ and $\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{V}}$ via

$$\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t(\hat{T}+\hat{V})} = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{e}^{t_i\Delta t\hat{T}}\mathrm{e}^{v_i\Delta t\hat{V}}, \tag{5.19}$$

with coefficients $\{t_i, v_i\}$ determined to match the LHS to any order in Δt, then one has general symplectic integrator for evolving the system forward in time. This reduces the original problem of Taylor series *analysis* to an *algebraic* problem of operator factorization. Furthermore, this general algebraic approximation of $\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t(\hat{T}+\hat{V})}$ for *any* two operators $\hat{T}$ and $\hat{V}$, is not restricted to Lie operators of classical mechanics. Thus identical schemes for decomposing $\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t(\hat{T}+\hat{V})}$ into products of $\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{T}}$ and $\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{V}}$ can yield equally useful algorithms for solving quantum mechanical or other physical evolution problems.

VI. MODIFIED HAMILTONIAN AND TIME-REVERSIBILITY

As in arithmetics, the inverse process of factorization is much more difficult than multiplication. However, in order to factorize, one must know something about multiplication. In the case of operators, the fundamental result of operator multiplication is the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula,

$$\mathrm{e}^{\hat{A}}\mathrm{e}^{\hat{B}} = \mathrm{e}^{\hat{C}} \tag{6.1}$$

where

$$\hat{C} = \hat{A} + \hat{B} + \frac{1}{2}[\hat{A},\hat{B}] + \frac{1}{12}([\hat{A},[\hat{A},\hat{B}]] + [\hat{B},[\hat{B},\hat{A}]]) + \cdots . \tag{6.2}$$

Using this, one immediately sees that,

$$\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{V}}\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{T}} = \mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{H}_{1A}}, \tag{6.3}$$

with

$$\hat{H}_{1A} = \hat{H} - \frac{1}{2}\Delta t[\hat{T},\hat{V}] + \frac{1}{12}\Delta t^2([\hat{T},[\hat{T},\hat{V}]] + [\hat{V},[\hat{V},\hat{T}]])\cdots . \tag{6.4}$$

Thus algorithm 1A gives the *exact* trajectory of the *modified* Hamiltonian H_{1A}, which approaches the original Hamiltonian H as $\Delta t \to 0$. To find the Hamiltonian function H_{1A} corresponding to the operator $\hat{H}_{1A}$, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
[\hat{T},\hat{V}]\ W &= \hat{T}\{W,V\} - \hat{V}\{W,T\}\,, \\
&= \{\{W,V\},T\} - \{\{W,T\},V\}\,, \\
&= \{W,\{V,T\}\}\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

where the last equality follows from the Jacobi identity

$$\{\{W,V\},T\} + \{\{T,W\},V\} + \{\{V,T\},W\} = 0\,.$$

Hence, there is a left-right order reversal, in going from a Lie commutator to its Poisson bracket:

$$[\hat{T},\hat{V}] \longrightarrow \{V,T\} = -\{T,V\}\,. \tag{6.6}$$

Applying this to (6.4) gives,[14,15]

$$H_{1A} = H + \frac{1}{2}\Delta t\{T,V\} + \frac{1}{12}\Delta t^2\{T,\{T,V\}\} + \frac{1}{12}\Delta t^2\{V,\{V,T\}\} + \ldots . \tag{6.7}$$

For the separable Hamiltonian (2.8), one has explicit results (recall that $v_i \equiv p_i/m$),

$$\{T,V\} = -\frac{\partial T}{\partial p_j}\frac{\partial V}{\partial q_j} = -v_j V_j = -vm\omega^2 q\,, \tag{6.8}$$

$$\{T,\{T,V\}\} = -\frac{\partial T}{\partial p_i}\frac{\partial \{T,V\}}{\partial q_i} = v_i V_{ij} v_j = m\omega^2 v^2\,, \tag{6.9}$$

$$\{V,\{V,T\}\} = \frac{\partial V}{\partial q_i}\frac{\partial \{V,T\}}{\partial p_i} = \frac{V_i V_i}{m} = m\omega^4 q^2\,, \tag{6.10}$$

where the last equality is for the 1D harmonic oscillator.

The modified Hamiltonian (6.7) directly gives the algorithm's global truncation errors in a closed, analytically form. These errors terms are generally non-separable (with mixed $v_i V_i(q_i)$ terms) and more complicated than the original Hamiltonian. In the case of the 1D harmonic oscillator, keeping the first-order term in (6.7) gives,

$$H_{1A} = \frac{1}{2}m\Big(v^2 + \omega^2 q^2 - \Delta t\omega^2 vq\Big) + O(\Delta t^2). \tag{6.11}$$

The global truncation error $-\frac{1}{2}m\Delta t\omega^2 vq = \frac{1}{2}\Delta t F(x)v$, is surprisingly, just the opposite of Cromer's result, his Eq.(15). Larsen[2] noted that Cromer's algorithm exactly conserves $v^2 + \omega^2 q^2 - \Delta t\omega^2 vq$. Keeping higher order terms in (6.7) modifies (6.11) to[7,16]

$$H_{1A} = \frac{1}{2}m\Big(v^2 + \omega^2 q^2 - \Delta t\omega^2 vq\Big)(1 + \frac{1}{6}\Delta t^2\omega^2 + \frac{1}{30}\Delta t^4\omega^4 + \cdots), \tag{6.12}$$

validating Larsen's original finding. Similarily, one finds that

$$H_{1B} = \frac{1}{2}m\Big(v^2 + \omega^2 q^2 + \Delta t\omega^2 vq\Big)(1 + \frac{1}{6}\Delta t^2\omega^2 + \frac{1}{30}\Delta t^4\omega^4 + \cdots), \tag{6.13}$$

whose first-order error is opposite in sign to that of $1A$, a fact also noted empirically by Stanley.[4] This again suggests that the average algorithm

$$\mathcal{T}_{AVG}(\Delta t) = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{T}_{1A}(\Delta t) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{T}_{1B}(\Delta t) \tag{6.14}$$

would have the error term $\Delta t\omega^2 vq$ cancelled and achieved the exact conservation of $v^2+\omega^2 q^2$! Unfortunately, averaging destroyed Liouville's theorem of $\det M = 1$ and the energy actually increases by a factor of $(1 + \omega^4\Delta t^4/4) = \det M$ after each such iteration.

For these two first-order algorithms, their Hamiltonians are distorted from the original elliptical form of $v^2 + \omega^2 q^2$ by the mixed first-order term $\Delta t\omega^2 vq$. This is related to the fact that these two algorithms are *not* time-reversible. Algorithm $1A$ cannot retrace its steps when ran backward in time because

$$\mathcal{T}_{1A}(-\Delta t)\mathcal{T}_{1A}(\Delta t) = \mathrm{e}^{-\Delta t\hat{V}}\mathrm{e}^{-\Delta t\hat{T}}\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{V}}\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{T}} \neq 1. \tag{6.15}$$

Similarly for $1B$. This means that these two first-order algorithms are qualitatively *different* from the exact solution, despite being symplectic.

We will now show that cancatenating $1A$ and $1B$ together will yield a *time-reversible* algorithm that is automatically second-order. Let

$$\mathcal{T}_{2A}(\Delta t) = \mathcal{T}_{1A}(\Delta t/2)\mathcal{T}_{1B}(\Delta t/2) = \mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{V}/2}\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{T}}\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{V}/2} = \mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{H}_{2A}(\Delta t)}, \tag{6.16}$$

with Lie transforms that are left-right symmetric. Hence, it is time-reversible

$$\mathcal{T}_{2A}(-\Delta t)\mathcal{T}_{2A}(\Delta t) = 1. \tag{6.17}$$

This then strongly constrains its modified Hamiltonian to be

$$\Delta t\hat{H}_{2A}(\Delta t) = \Delta t\hat{H} + \Delta t^3\hat{E}_2 + \Delta t^5\hat{E}_4 + \cdots, \tag{6.18}$$

with only even-order error operators $\hat{E}_2, \hat{E}_4$, etc., otherwise, if $\hat{H}_{2A}(\Delta t)$ has any odd-order error term, then $\Delta t\hat{H}_{2A}(\Delta t)$ would have a term even in Δt and

$$\mathrm{e}^{-\Delta t\hat{H}_{2A}(-\Delta t)}\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{H}_{2A}(\Delta t)} \neq 1, \tag{6.19}$$

contradicting (6.17). Thus any algorithm with left-right symmetric Lie transforms must be an even-order algorithm, automatically of at least second-order.

The affect of $\mathcal{T}_{2A}(\Delta t)$ on $W(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{v})$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{V}/2}\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{T}}\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{V}/2}W(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{v}) = \mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{V}/2}W(\mathbf{q}+\Delta t\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}+\frac{\Delta t}{2}\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}+\Delta t\mathbf{v})) \\
&= W\Big(\mathbf{q}+\Delta t\Big[\mathbf{v}+\frac{\Delta t}{2}\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q})\Big], \mathbf{v}+\frac{\Delta t}{2}\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q})+\frac{\Delta t}{2}\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}+\Delta t\Big[\mathbf{v}+\frac{\Delta t}{2}\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q})\Big])\Big),
\end{aligned} \tag{6.20}$$

which translates to algorithm $2A$ of (4.14). The error operator $\hat{E}_2$ is

$$\hat{E}_2 = \frac{1}{12}\Big([\hat{T},[\hat{T},\hat{V}]] - \frac{1}{2}[\hat{V},[\hat{V},\hat{T}]]\Big). \tag{6.21}$$

For the harmonic oscillator, (6.9) and (6.10) give

$$H_{2A} = \frac{1}{2}m\Big([1+\frac{1}{6}\omega^2\Delta t^2]v^2 + [1-\frac{1}{12}\omega^2\Delta t^2]\omega^2 q^2\Big) + O(\Delta t^4), \tag{6.22}$$

which now modifies the two quadratic terms with no mixed cross term. The other symplectic second-order algorithm is,

$$\mathcal{T}_{2B}(\Delta t) = \mathcal{T}_{1B}(\Delta t/2)\mathcal{T}_{1A}(\Delta t/2) = \mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{T}/2}\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{V}}\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{T}/2} = \mathrm{e}^{\Delta t\hat{H}_{2B}(\Delta t)}, \tag{6.23}$$

which produces algorithm $2B$ of (4.15). Since this is just $2A$ with $T \leftrightarrow V$, one has simply, for the harmonic oscillator,

$$H_{2B} = \frac{1}{2}m\Big([1 - \frac{1}{12}\omega^2\Delta t^2]v^2 + [1 + \frac{1}{6}\omega^2\Delta t^2]\omega^2 q^2\Big) + O(\Delta t^4). \tag{6.24}$$

The average of (6.22) and (6.24) would give,

$$\frac{1}{2}(H_{2A} + H_{2B}) = \frac{1}{2}m[1 + \frac{1}{24}\omega^2\Delta t^2]\Big(v^2 + \omega^2 q^2\Big) + O(\Delta t^4)$$

which suggest that the error in $v^2 + \omega^2 q^2$ is now $O(\Delta t^4)$, as also noted by Stanley. Unfortunately, this is not true for more general potentials, and a fourth-order algorithm cannot be so easily constructed by just averaging.

Summarizing, there are two basic canonical first-order algorithms $1A$ (5.13) and $1B$ (5.16). By averaging, one obtains the non-symplectic, second-order Runge-Kutta algorithm (6.14). By cancatenating, one obatins the two symplectic second-order algorithms $2A$ (6.16) and $2B$ (6.23). As shown in Section IV, all these algorithms can be derived by using generators of canonical transformations. However, the use of Lie transforms not only vastly simplified their derivations, but also unmasked each algorithm's underlying Hamiltonian. As will be shown in the next section, this is a key breakthrough by which higher order symplectic integrators can be derived.

VII. HIGHER-ORDER SYMPLECTIC INTEGRATORS

The derivation of the first fourth-order symplectic algorithm in the late 1980's initiated the modern development of symplectic integrators. According to Forest,[17] the first fourth-order symplectic integrator was obtained by Ruth in 1985 by numerically solving equations with hundreds of terms. Forest was able to show that it is a splitting algorithm in 1986.[17] However, their lengthy derivation of the algorithm involving a complicated cube root was not published jointly until 1990.[12] Around the same time, many groups, including Campostrini and Rossi,[18] Suzuki,[19] Yoshida,[20], Candy and Rozmous[21] and Bandrauk and Shen,[22] have independently arrived at the same algorithm. However, the earliest published work, is that of Creutz and Gocksch,[23] who learned the the fourth-order algorithm from Campostrini, provided a simpler derivation, generalized it to higher orders, and publish it in 1989! The convergence of so many people from different fields, all onto the same algorithm at about the same time, is remarkable. Here, we follow the simpler derivation of Ref.24.

From (6.16) and (6.18), one has (where $\mathcal{T}_2$ denotes either $\mathcal{T}_{2A}$ or $\mathcal{T}_{2B}$)

$$\mathcal{T}_2(\Delta t) = \exp(\Delta t\hat{H} + \Delta t^3\hat{E}_2 + \Delta t^5\hat{E}_4 + \cdots), \tag{7.1}$$

with only odd powers of Δt in the exponent. Consider a triple product of this algorithm at step size ϵ,

$$\mathcal{T}_2(\epsilon)\mathcal{T}_2(-s\epsilon)\mathcal{T}_2(\epsilon) = \exp[(2-s)\epsilon\hat{H} + (2-s^3)\epsilon^3\hat{E}_2 + O(\epsilon^5)]. \tag{7.2}$$

This algorithm evolves the system forward for time ϵ, *backward* for time $s\epsilon$ and forward again for time ϵ. Since it is manifestly left-right symmetric, and hence time-reversible, its exponent must consist of terms with only odd powers of ϵ. Moreover, its leading ϵ^3 term can only be due to the sum of ϵ^3 terms of each constituent algorithm as indicated, without any commutator terms. This is because any single-commutator of $\epsilon\hat{H}$, $\epsilon^3\hat{E}_2$, etc., would be even in ϵ and hence excluded. Any double-commutator would have a minimum of two $\epsilon\hat{H}$ and one $\epsilon^3\hat{E}_2$, which is already fifth order in ϵ.

To obtain a fourth-order algorithm, it is only necessary to eliminate this ϵ^3 error term by choosing

$$s = 2^{\,1/3} \tag{7.3}$$

and scale ϵ back to the standard step size by setting $\Delta t = (2-s)\epsilon$,

$$\mathcal{T}_4(\Delta t) \equiv \mathcal{T}_2\Big(\frac{\Delta t}{2-s}\Big)\mathcal{T}_2\Big(\frac{-s\,\Delta t}{2-s}\Big)\mathcal{T}_2\Big(\frac{\Delta t}{2-s}\Big) = \exp[\,\Delta t\hat{H} + O(\Delta t^5)]. \tag{7.4}$$

This derivation has no need to solve any cubic equation. This triplet fourth-order symplectic schemes only require 3 force-evaluations per iteration. The original Ruth-Forest[12] algorithm consisted of substituting the explicite forms of $\mathcal{T}_{2A,2B}$ in (7.4) and combined the 2 adjacent edge Lie transforms into one.

Clearly, this triple-product construction can be repeated to generate arbitrary even-order algorithms. For example, a sixth-order algorithm can be obtained by taking

$$\mathcal{T}_6 \equiv \mathcal{T}_4\Big(\frac{\Delta t}{2-s}\Big)\mathcal{T}_4\Big(\frac{-s\,\Delta t}{2-s}\Big)\mathcal{T}_4\Big(\frac{\Delta t}{2-s}\Big). \tag{7.5}$$

and choosing $s = 2^{1/5}$ to eliminate the fifth-order error term in $\mathcal{T}_4$. One can then cancatenates three $\mathcal{T}_6$ to give $\mathcal{T}_8$ by choosing $s = 2^{1/7}$ etc..

While deriving arbitrary even-order symplectic integrator via the triple product construction is a fundamental advance, it was soon realized that this method has two disadvantges:

First, these algorithms have large negative time-steps and large errors. Recall Newton's equation of motion: $m\ddot{x}(t) = F(x(t))$. The same trajectory $x(t)$ appears on both sides of the equation. This means that the force that drives the particle along its trajectory is always evaluated *at* the trajectory. The large negative time steps in these algorithms forces the force to be evaluated farther off the trajectory,[25] resulting in larger errors. Also, these operator factorization schemes with backward time steps cannot be used to solve *time-irreversible problems* with a diffusion kernel ∇^2, such as in solving the Schrödinger equation in imaginary time. Second, this construction is highly uneconomical beyond the fourth-order. The number of force-evaluations needed at order $2n$ grows exponentially as 3^{n-1}. It is already uneconomical at the sixth order, required nine force-evaluations. As we will see later, a sixth-order Runge-Kutta-Nyström algorithm only requires five force-evaluations.

A more general approach of deriving symplectic integrators is to approximate the short-time evolution operator directly as a product of Lie transforms, as in (5.19). On can choose $\{t_i, v_i\}$ to be left-right symmetric and determine their values by the order conditions of the algorithm. Since the order conditions are nonlinear, these cofficients can only be given numerically. See Yoshida[20] for the first sixth-order algorithm, requiring 7 force-evaluations. Even with the direct use of Lie transforms, each error commutator $\hat{E}$ will generate two more error commutators $[\hat{T}, \hat{E}]$ and $[\hat{V}, \hat{E}]$ in the next order. Thus the number of error terms proliforates as 2^n and the number of force evaluations will still grow exponentially as $2^n - 1$. The only way to stop this exponential growth is to abandon symplectic integrators in favor of non-symplectic, Runge-Kutta-Nyström type algorithms, which is the topic of the next Section.

With the general approach of (5.19), it is not possible to eliminate negative time-steps beyond the second-order. This is because if $\{t_i, v_i\}$ were all positive, then there is no way to cancel sucessive error commutators in (5.19). (In the second-order case, the error term $\Delta t^2[\hat{T}, \hat{V}]$ is automatically eliminated by symmetrization.) Formally, this result has been proved variously by Sheng,[26] Suzuki,[27] Goldman and Kaper,[28] Blandes and Casas,[29] and Chin[30]. However, it was observed by Chin[31] that, for example,

$$\mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{6}\Delta t\hat{V}}\mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{2}\Delta t\hat{T}}\mathrm{e}^{\frac{2}{3}\Delta t\hat{V}}\mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{2}\Delta t\hat{T}}\mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{6}\Delta t\hat{V}} = \mathrm{e}^{\Delta t(\hat{T}+\hat{V})+\frac{\Delta t^3}{72}[\hat{V},[\hat{V},\hat{T}]]+O(\Delta t^5)}. \tag{7.6}$$

If one then moves the double-commutator term $[\hat{V}, [\hat{V}, \hat{T}]]$ to the LHS symmetrically,

$$\mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{6}\Delta t\hat{V}}\mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{2}\Delta t\hat{T}}\mathrm{e}^{\frac{2}{3}\Delta t(\hat{V}-\frac{\Delta t^2}{48}[\hat{V},[\hat{V},\hat{T}]])}\mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{2}\Delta t\hat{T}}\mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{6}\Delta t\hat{V}} = \mathrm{e}^{\Delta t(\hat{T}+\hat{V})+O(\Delta t^5)}, \tag{7.7}$$

the resulting algorithm would be fourth-order. (This operator splitting has also been stated by Suzuki,[32] but not derived.) Since $[\hat{V},[\hat{V},\hat{T}]]$ corresponds to a local function given by (6.10), the above simply modified the potential at the central step to

$$V \to V - \frac{\Delta t^2}{48}\frac{V_i V_i}{m}. \tag{7.8}$$

This then yields a fourth-order *forward* time-step algorithm

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{v}_1 &= \mathbf{v}_0 + \frac{1}{6}\Delta t \mathbf{a}_0,\\
\mathbf{q}_1 &= \mathbf{q}_0 + \frac{1}{2}\Delta t \mathbf{v}_1,\\
\mathbf{v}_2 &= \mathbf{v}_1 + \frac{2}{3}\Delta t(\mathbf{a}_1 + \frac{\Delta t^2}{48}\nabla|\mathbf{a}_1|^2),\\
\mathbf{q}_2 &= \mathbf{q}_1 + \frac{1}{2}\Delta t \mathbf{v}_2,\\
\mathbf{v}_3 &= \mathbf{v}_2 + \frac{1}{6}\Delta t \mathbf{a}_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.9}$$

This is an entirely new type of *forward time* symplectic algorithm, unanticipated from classical numerical analysis and has a much smaller error than the backward time step, Forest-Ruth algorithm (7.2). By using more Lie transforms in (7.6), more accurate forward fourth-order schemes have been derived in Ref.33 and 34. Unfortunately, it is not possible to obtain explicit forward time-step algorithm beyond the fourth-order.[35] Higher order algorithms would require an additional term in the Hamiltonian which is a mixed product of momenta and coordinates. Such a term would make the Hamiltonian *non-separatable* and difficult to solve.

To reduce the number of force-evaluations at higher orders, we turn now to a different method of approximating evolution operator $\mathrm{e}^{\Delta t(\hat{T}+\hat{V})}$.

VIII. HIGHER-ORDER RUNGE-KUTTA-NYSTRÖM ALGORITHMS

The triplet construction of higher order symplectic algorithms is based on eliminating the errors (7.1) of $\mathcal{T}_2$, , via a product of $\mathcal{T}_2$'s. However, since

$$\mathcal{T}_2^k(\Delta t/k) = \exp(\Delta t\hat{H} + k^{-2}\Delta t^3\hat{E}_2 + k^{-4}\Delta t^5\hat{E}_4 + \cdots), \tag{8.1}$$

these higher order errors can alternatively be eliminated by extrapolation. For example, a fourth-order algorithm can be obtained by the combination

$$\mathcal{T}_4(\Delta t) = \frac{1}{3}\Big[4\mathcal{T}_2^2\left(\frac{\Delta t}{2}\right) - \mathcal{T}_2(\Delta t)\Big], \tag{8.2}$$

where the factor 4 cancels the Δt^3 error term and the factor 3 restores the original Hamiltonian term $\Delta t H$. Because this is no longer a single product of Lie transforms, the algorithm is no longer symplectic. Take $\mathcal{T}_2$ to be $\mathcal{T}_{2A}$, whose algorithmic form is given by (4.17), then $\mathcal{T}_{2A}^2(\Delta t/2)$ corresponds to iterating that twice at half the step size:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{q}_1' &= \mathbf{q}_0 + \frac{1}{2}\Delta t \mathbf{v}_0 + \frac{1}{8}\Delta t^2 \mathbf{a}_0, \\
\mathbf{v}_2' &= \mathbf{v}_0 + \frac{1}{4}\Delta t(\mathbf{a}_0 + \mathbf{a}_{1'}), \\
\mathbf{q}_2 &= \mathbf{q}_1' + \frac{1}{2}\Delta t \mathbf{v}_2' + \frac{1}{8}\Delta t^2 \mathbf{a}_{1'}, \\
\mathbf{v}_3 &= \mathbf{v}_2' + \frac{1}{4}\Delta t(\mathbf{a}_{1'} + \mathbf{a}_2).
\end{aligned} \tag{8.3}$$

The first two lines are just (4.17) at $\Delta t/2$, and the second two lines simply repeat that with $\mathbf{q}_1'$ and $\mathbf{v}_2'$ as initial values. Eliminating the intermediate values $\mathbf{q}_1'$ and $\mathbf{v}_2'$ gives

$$\mathbf{q}_2 = \mathbf{q}_0 + \Delta t \mathbf{v}_0 + \frac{1}{4}\Delta t^2(\mathbf{a}_0 + \mathbf{a}_{1'}), \tag{8.4}$$

$$\mathbf{v}_3 = \mathbf{v}_0 + \frac{1}{4}\Delta t(\mathbf{a}_0 + 2\mathbf{a}_{1'} + \mathbf{a}_2). \tag{8.5}$$

The combination (8.2) then gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{q} &= \frac{4}{3}\mathbf{q}_2 - \frac{1}{3}\mathbf{q}_1 = \mathbf{q}_0 + \Delta t\, \mathbf{v}_0 + \frac{\Delta t^2}{6}\left(\mathbf{a}_0 + 2\mathbf{a}_{1'}\right), \\
\mathbf{v} &= \frac{4}{3}\mathbf{v}_3 - \frac{1}{3}\mathbf{v}_2 = \mathbf{v}_0 + \frac{\Delta t}{6}\left(\mathbf{a}_0 + 4\mathbf{a}_{1'} + 2\mathbf{a}_2 - \mathbf{a}_1\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{8.6}$$

This appears to required 4 force-evaluations at $\mathbf{q}_0$, $\mathbf{q}_1'$ (8.3), $\mathbf{q}_2$ (8.4) and $\mathbf{q}_1$ (4.16). However, the force subtraction above can be combined:

$$\begin{aligned}
2\mathbf{a}_2 - \mathbf{a}_1 &= 2\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}_2) - \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}_1) \\
&= 2\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}_1 + \delta\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}_1) \\
&= \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}_1) + 2\delta\mathbf{q}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}_1) + O(\delta\mathbf{q}^2) \\
&= \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}_1 + 2\delta\mathbf{q}) + O(\delta\mathbf{q}^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{8.7}$$

Since

$$\delta\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{q}_2 - \mathbf{q}_1 = \frac{\Delta t^2}{4}(\mathbf{a}_{1'} - \mathbf{a}_0) \approx O(\Delta t^3), \tag{8.8}$$

one then has

$$2\mathbf{a}_2 - \mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}_0 + \Delta t \mathbf{v}_0 + \frac{1}{2}\Delta t^2 \mathbf{a}_{1'}) + O(\Delta t^6). \tag{8.9}$$

Hence, correct to $O(\Delta t^4)$, the two force-evaluations on the LHS can be replaced by just one force-evaluation and (8.6) reproduces Nyström's original fourth-order integrator.[36,37]

There are thus three basic fourth-order algorithm with 3 force-evaluations: backward time step symplectic algorithms (7.4), forward time step symplectic integrator (7.9) and non-symplectic Nyström[36] algorithm (8.6). From this perspective, symplectic and non-symplectic algorithms corresponds to approximating the evolution operator as a single product or a multiple products of Lie transforms.

The extrapolation, or multi-product expansion (8.2) can be generalized to arbitrary even[38] or odd[39] orders, for example:

$$\mathcal{T}_6(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{24}\mathcal{T}_2(\epsilon) - \frac{16}{15}\mathcal{T}_2^2\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) + \frac{81}{40}\mathcal{T}_2^3\left(\frac{\epsilon}{3}\right), \tag{8.10}$$

$$\mathcal{T}_8(\epsilon) = -\frac{1}{360}\mathcal{T}_2(\epsilon) + \frac{16}{45}\mathcal{T}_2^2\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) - \frac{729}{280}\mathcal{T}_2^3\left(\frac{\epsilon}{3}\right) + \frac{1024}{315}\mathcal{T}_2^4\left(\frac{\epsilon}{4}\right). \tag{8.11}$$

For order p =3-6, force subtractions can be combined similarly as above so that the number of force-evaluation is reduced to $p-1$. Most known RNK algorithms[37] up to order six can be derived in this manner. At order $p = 7$, the number of force-evaluation is 7. At order $p > 7$, the number of force-evaluation is greater the p.

IX. CONCLUDING SUMMARY

In this work, we have outlined the "modern synthesis" of numerical algorithms for solving classical dynamics. There is no arbitrariness at all in the choice of elementary algorithms. There are only two standard, canonical, and time-reversible second-order algorithms (4.14) and (4.15), out of which nearly all higher-order symplectic *and* Runge-Kutta-Nyström algorithms can be derived. The stability of symplectic integrators can be simply understood as due to their *sequentual* updating of conjugate variables, which is a fundamental but little appreciated property of canonical transformations (4.3) and (4.4). It is out of the deepest part of analytical mechanics, the use the Poissonian formulation and Lie transforms, that one can most easily understand the structure of symplectic and non-symplectic algorithms. The former is derived from a single product of Lie transforms while the latter is due to a sum of products of Lie transforms. From this prospective, it is also easy to see why the former obeys Liouville's theorem, and the latter does not. Since these algorithms are splitting

approximations of the exact evolution operator, similar algorithms can be derived for solving quantum mechanical,[33] time-dependent force,[39] or velocity-dependent magnetic force[40] problems.

---

* chin@physics.tamu.edu

[1] Alan Cromer, "Stable solutions using the Euler approximation,"Am. J Phys. 49, 455-459 (1981).

[2] Kenneth M. Larsen, "Note on stable solutions using the Euler approximation," Am. J. Phys. 51, 273 (1983).

[3] A. Bellemans, "Stable algorithms for integrating Newton's equation,"Am. J. Phys. 51, 275-276 (1983).

[4] Robert W. Stanley, "Numerical methods in mechanics,"Am. J. Phys. 52, 499-507 (1984).

[5] Todd Timberlake and Javier E. Hasbun "Computations in classical mechanics," Am. J. Phys. 76, 334-339 (2008).

[6] Thomas F. Jordan,"Steppingstones in Hamiltonian dynamics," Am. J. Phys. 72, 1095-1099 (2004).

[7] Denis Donnelly and Edwin Rogers, "Symplectic integrators: An introduction" Am. J. Phys. 73, 938-945 (2005).

[8] J. Marsden and M. West, "Discrete mechanics and variational integrators", Acta Numerica, 2001, pp. 357-514.

[9] H. Goldstein, *Classical Mechanics*, 2rd edition, Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1980.

[10] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Mechanics*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1960.

[11] A. J. Dragt and J. M. Finn, "Lie series and invariant functions for analytic symplectic maps", J. Math. Phys. 17, 2215-2224 (1976).

[12] E. Forest and R. D. Ruth, "4th-order symplectic integration", Physica D 43, 105-117 (1990).

[13] F. Neri, "Lie algebras and canonical integration," Technical Report, Department of Physics, University of Maryland preprint, 1987, unpublished.

[14] H. Yoshida, " Recent progress in the theory and application of symplectic integrators", Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron. 56, 27-43 (1993).

[15] Sante R. Scuro and Siu A. Chin, "Forward symplectic integrators and the long-time phase error in periodic motions", Phys. Rev. E 71, 056703 (2005).

[16] S. R. Scuro and Siu A. Chin, "Exact evolution of time-reversible symplectic integrators and their phase errors for the harmonic oscillator", Phys. Lett. A 342, 397-403 (2005)

[17] R. Forest, "Geometric integration for particle accelerators", J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 39, 5321-5377 (2006).

[18] M. Campostrini and P. Rossi, "A comparison of numerical algorithms for dynamical fermions" Nucl. Phys. B329, 753-764 (1990).

[19] M. Suzuki, "Fractal decomposition of exponential operators with applications to many-body theories and Monte Carlo simulations", Phys. Lett. A, 146(1990)319-323.

[20] H. Yoshida, "Construction of higher order symplectic integrators", Phys. Lett. A 150, 262-268 (1990).

[21] J. Candy and W. Rozmus, "A symplectic integration algorithm for separable Hamiltonian functions" J. Comp. Phys. 92, 230-256 (1991).

[22] A. D. Bandrauk and H. Shen, "Improved exponential split operator method for solving the time-dependent Schrödinger equation" Chem. Phys. Lett. 176, 428-432 (1991).

[23] M. Creutz and A. Gocksch, "Higher-order hydrid Monte-Carlo algorithms", Phys. Rev. Letts. 63, 9-12 (1989).

[24] Siu A. Chin and Donald W. Kidwell, "Higher-order force gradient algorithms", Phys. Rev. E 62, 8746-8752 (2000).

[25] Siu A. Chin, "Forward and non-forward symplectic integrators in solving classical dynamics problems", Intl. J. Compt. Math. 84, 729-747 (2007).

[26] Q. Sheng, "Solving linear partial differential equations by exponential splitting", IMA Journal of numberical anaysis, 9, 199-212 (1989).

[27] M. Suzuki, "General theory of fractal path-integrals with applications to many-body theories and statistical physics", J. Math. Phys. 32, 400-407 (1991).

[28] D. Goldman and T. J. Kaper, "Nth-order operator splitting schemes and nonreversible systems", SIAM J. Numer. Anal., **33**, 349-367 (1996).

[29] S. Blanes and F. Casas, "On the necessity of negative coefficients for operator splitting schemes of order higher than two", Appl. Numer. Math. **54**, 23 (2005).

[30] Siu A. Chin, "A fundamental theorem on the structure of symplectic integrators", Phys. Letts. A 354, 373-376 (2006)

[31] Siu A. Chin, "Symplectic integrators from composite operator factorizations", Phys. Lett. A 226, 344-348 (1997).

[32] M. Suzuki, "New scheme of hybrid Exponential product formulas with applications to quantum Monte Carlo simulations" in *Computer Simulation Studies in Condensed Matter Physics VIII*, eds, D. Landau, K. Mon and H. Schuttler (Springler, Berlin, P.1-6, 1996.

[33] Siu A. Chin and C. R. Chen, "Gradient symplectic algorithms for solving the Schrödinger equation with time-dependent potentials", J. Chem. Phys. **117**, 1409-1415 (2002).

[34] I. P. Omelyan, I. M. Mryglod and R. Folk, "Construction of high-order force-gradient algorithms for integration of motion in classical and quantum systems", Phys. Rev. E 66, 026701 (2002).

[35] Siu A. Chin, Phys. Rev. E 71, 016703 (2005). Erratum: e_{TVT} should read e_{VTV} in Eq.(2.12).

[36] E. J. Nyström, *Über die Numerische Integration von Differentialgleichungen*, Acta Societatis Scientiarum Ferrica 50, 1-55 (1925).

[37] R. H. Battin, *An Introduction to the Mathematics and Methods of Astrodynamics, Reviesed Edition*, AIAA, 1999.

[38] Siu A. Chin, "Multi-product splitting and Runge-Kutta-Nystrom integrators", Cele. Mech. Dyn. Astron. 106, 391-406 (2010).

[39] Siu A. Chin and Jurgen Geiser, "Multi-product operator splitting as a general method of solving autonomous and nonautonomous equations", IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis 2011; doi: 10.1093/imanum/drq022.

[40] Siu A. Chin, "Symplectic and energy-conserving algorithms for solving magnetic field trajectories", Phys. Rev. E 77, 066401 (2008).